**Discussion Item #1 …**Categories of Issues

* funding level & variety of funding mechanisms
* capacity
* political and (RO)institutional support
* individuals actively participating
* innovative and collaborative science
* projects that reflect stakeholder-driven needs for science and tools
* collaboration across boundaries and jurisdictions
* influencing on-the-ground conservation decisions

NAS Review…Critical components that are important for such collaborative efforts include

* strong stakeholder engagement,
* adaptive management,
* strategic planning efforts,
* metrics to aggregate project impacts,
* leveraging, and
* a lead agency that provides resources and leadership.   
   …However, a firm financial commitment seems essential to sustaining the LCCs. …no single non-federal partner—and particularly states--have a mandate or jurisdiction that allows or encourages them to coordinate at a coast-to-coast geographic or international level; this suggests that federal coordination is warranted if it’s done with full recognition and appreciation for the individual authorities and mandates of individual partners in the LCCs.
* unifying theme,

**Discussion Item #2 … Existing Challenges/Barriers**

Notes from: LCC White Paper, Elsa Haubold and Greg Wathen. Prepared for National Landscape Practitioners Forum, Nov. 2017.

**Coordinators ‘inherited’ Challenges (& fatal flaws)**

1. Roll-out
2. Partner Fatigue
3. Partner Understanding
4. Identity / Imperative

**(1) [Roll-out] Defining the Partnership**

**Foundational/Underlying Assumption:** *partnership should reflect the relevant system(s) as defined by the impact (issue) to be addressed and thereby identify/invite membership. In the case of LCCs, the climate impacts systems that ignore social/jurisdictional boundaries.*

**Approach:** *The operational approach chosen to respond to the climate and environmental challenges was defined based on an ecological “systems-focus” vs. an organizational “implementation-focus”*

**Fatal flaw:** *design of the partnership was operationally ‘blind’ of admin or legislative organizational responsibilities and authority, and therefore possibly limit participation and potential success.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Challenge/Problem** | ISSUE: “initial roll-out of LCCs in 2010 was poorly executed”   * (the concept was created by a limited number of staff in a single agency and did not engage partners in its creation). |
| **Impact** | * partners felt the LCCs were forced on them * LCCs were not uniformly embraced by partners. |
| **Steps to Overcome** |  |
| **(+ /-) Outcome** | “positive strides in partner relationships have been achieved in recent years” |
| **As Evident By** | “There is interest in the program such that there are occasional Congressional requests for briefings on the LCC program and the previously uninterested House has provided funding in their last two appropriations bills” |

**(2) [Partner Fatigue] Expectation of Participation and Engagement**

**Foundational/Underlying Assumption:** *Strength of the Partnership equated to capacity of the collective. Success dependent on member organizational representation and level of engagement.*

**Approach:** *Nationally the various units (LCCs) were established asynchronously, and at Tiered level of funding and staffing. Lack of synchrony and equity across the network resulted in units competing for key members.*

**Fatal flaw:** *Failure to compensate for the constraints on member organizations’ limited staffing-levels and capacity to engage resulted in the inability to engage all necessary partners due to “Partner Fatigue”.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Challenge/Problem** | LCC (operational unit area) boundarycross (multiple) state boundaries.  “LCC boundarycross their state boundaries; governance relies on partner organizational representation; “some cases, agencies simply do not have the staff ~~capacity~~ to provide representatives to sit on all geographically- or topically-relevant Steering Committees or Boards” …**] pg 7** |
| **Impact** | * **Partner fatigue …** difficult for some partners to participate in all of these efforts” * may be a cause of some of the resistance that LCCs have experienced over the years. |
| **Steps to Overcome** | NAS Review of LCCs recognized partner fatigue as a challenge for LCCs, and   * recommended that LCCs and Joint Ventures and Fish Habitat Partnerships coordinate more effectively, partly in response to that challenge, |
| **(+ /-) Outcome** | * To address this limitation in some regions, a constellation of LCCs have combined initiatives on a particular topic or split out topics among themselves, resulting in states or organizations choosing which LCC to participate in based on their perceived relevance of those topics (*Q. is Gulf Hypox the example in the reference to constellation of LCCs?)* |
| **As Evident By** | [NAS Review offered this should be..]   * there is not redundancy between the programs, and * to increase overall conservation outcomes |

**(3) [Partner Understanding] (Board) meeting structure to ensure understanding among participants**

**Foundational/Underlying Assumption:** *Participation in Partnership meetings would ensure information flow back to member organization.*

**Approach:**

**Fatal flaw:** *[not sure if it’s a case of (a) wrong organizational represented selected (personal attributes; level within the organization, or (b) message not clearly delivered relying (solely) on partnership meetings as the fora to build the understanding and/or materials sufficient to support the representative’s efforts to communication / ‘reporting back’ the work of, and significance of the work of partnership (LCC).]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Challenge/Problem** | participants in the LCC Network may not communicate with their home organizations about the work of the LCC and how it is benefiting their organization’s mission and goals |
| **Impact** | This can leave organization leadership with the belief that the LCCs are not useful to them and not contributing to their needs. |
| **Steps to Overcome** |  |
| **(+ /-) Outcome** |  |
| **As Evident By** |  |

**(4) [Identity / Imperative]** LCCs reported on a narrow-set of metrics (wildlife-centric vs. landscape impact) making it difficult to that roll-up to quantify impact and assess cumulative contribution of the Network.

**Foundational/Underlying Assumption:**The unifying vision of the LCC Network creation focused on its critical function as a climate adaptation response. But quickly that was silenced in response to political pressures in efforts to retain funding support. Other more immediate threat-based responses were identified as priorities, reflecting the diversity of their partners and their partnerships’ priorities, and to some extent, the regional and cultural differences that exist across the Network.

**Approach:**Lacking a unifying vision, the LCC Network (collectively) has established a variety of priorities, reflecting the diversity of their partners and their partnerships’ priorities, and to some extent, the regional and cultural differences that exist across the Network.

**Fatal flaw:**Related to the challenge in the “roll-out” of LCCs approach on the national agenda, was the inability to explain the imperative of the approach as the truly value-added function of a nationally-coordinated landscape approach (LCC Network). Abandoning efforts to communicate the forward-looking climate response and its critical need in conserving natural resources, biological diversity, and environmental heath was short-sighted. That left the Network without a unifying vision and mission and struggling to communicate what the Network is. Related to this is confusion surrounding how LCCs, CSCs, JVs, and Fish Habitat Partnerships and other partnerships are unique and complementary.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Challenge/Problem** |  |
| **Impact** | * initial skepticism about the network, * fine tension between the self-directed nature of each LCC and being part of a network * has contributed to lack of understanding even by some who have engaged in the LCCs as to what the LCCs are, how they are different, and what their value added is. |
| **Steps to Overcome** | [re: identity] LCC Network has had extensive discussions around the idea of “an ecologically connected network of landscapes and seascapes”, and this is emerging as a potential unifying purpose for LCCs. |
| **(+ /-) Outcome** |  |
| **As Evident By** |  |